

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the above amendments and the followings remarks. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, and 15 have been amended. Claims 16-31 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and are directed to withdrawn subject matter. New claims 32-33 have been added. The amendments to claim 1 are supported by original claim 5 and at least Figure 3 of the present specification. The amendments to claim 7 are supported by at least Figure 3 and the description at pages 6-9 of the present specification. The amendments to claims 4, 5, and 15 are also supported by Figure 3 and the related description of Figures 2-3 of the present specification. No new matter has been added.

§ 102 Rejection

Claims 1-3 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lujic (US 4,319,126). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Lujic discloses a temperature responsive switching device with reference to Figures 3 and 4 that includes a solder link 14 between a rigid contact 4 on one metal strip 3 and the end of a another metal strip 15. The strips 3, 15 are connected at an opposing end to a molded piece 1. The metal strip 3 and contact 4 maintain a constant position at all times. The strip 15 is formed of a spring material that is pre-stressed from a position shown in dotted line in Figure 3 to the position shown in solid line in Figure 3. Thus, when the solder link 14 is melted through, the strip 15 is quickly brought into position indicated by the dashed L line shown in Figure 3, thereby disconnecting the strip 15 from the strip 3.

The tongues 3, 15 are aligned generally parallel to each other and are spaced apart from each other in a radial or transverse direction relative to the direction of extension of each of those strips. Further, it is the strip 15 itself that is spring-loaded so that it actively moves away from the strip 3 when the solder link 14 is melted through.

Lujic fails to disclose a heat conductive structure of a connection system that includes "first and second elongate conductors aligned longitudinally with free ends of the elongate conductors adjacent to each other," as required by claim 1. As noted above, the metal strips 3, 15 disclosed by Lujic are spaced apart and extend parallel to each other and are not aligned

longitudinally. Therefore, Lujic fails to disclose every limitation of claim 1 and the claims that depend from it.

Further, Lujic fails to disclose that "the first and second elongate members are configured as wire members that are aligned coaxially," as required by claim 5. The strips 3, 15 disclosed by Lujic are strips of metal as shown in the top view of Figure 4. The rejections reference to column 1, line 64 of Lujic for support of first and second wire members fails to meet the limitations of claim 5. Lujic merely discloses that the switching device may be provided with connecting elements for connecting to electrical cables. However, the switching device itself does not include wires, cables, or the like. Therefore, Lujic fails to disclose every limitation of claim 5 for this additional reason.

§ 103 Rejections

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lujic. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. As discussed above, Lujic fails to disclose or suggest every limitation of claim 1. Therefore, claim 4 is allowable for at least the reason it is dependent upon an allowable base claim. Furthermore, as discussed above Lujic fails to disclose or suggest a coaxial cable or any other wire-like structure as part of the switching device. Therefore, Lujic fails to disclose or suggest every limitation of claim 4 for this additional reason.

Claims 6-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lujic in view of Hastings (US 4,748,915). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As discussed above, Lujic fails to disclose or suggest every limitation of claims 1 and 5. Therefore, claim 6 is allowable for at least the reason it is dependent upon an allowable base claim. Furthermore, Lujic fails to disclose or suggest that any of the features of the switching device are configured as wire members, specifically the strips 3, 15 being wire members. Still further, neither Lujic nor Hastings discloses or suggests that a wire member portion of a connection device such as the switching device disclosed by Lujic "is configured to extend through an exterior wall of a heat resistant container that houses the electronic device," as required by claim 6. Therefore, claim 6 is allowable for this additional reason.

Lujic fails to disclose or suggest a "heat conductive structure including first and second elongate conductors aligned generally longitudinally," as required by claim 7 for at least those reasons discussed above related to claim 1. Hastings fails to remedy the deficiencies of Lujic as it relates to claim 7. Hastings discloses an enclosure for containment of electronic data processing equipment, banking apparatus, and the like. Hastings is completely silent concerning a connection system that provides transfer of a communication signal from outside of the enclosure to the equipment/apparatus held within the enclosure. Therefore, Lujic and Hastings alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest every limitation of claim 7 and the claims that depend from it.

Furthermore, Hastings fails to recognize the problems solved by the fireproof system required by claim 7. While Hastings generally discloses protection of the equipment/apparatus held within the enclosure, Hastings fails to recognize the problem heat damage to the enclosed equipment/apparatus caused by heat conducted through the conductive structure that provides transfer of a communication signal from outside the enclosure and the enclosed equipment/apparatus. Therefore, one skilled in the art would have no motivation to combine the switching device disclosed by Lujic with the enclosure disclosed by Hastings. Thus, Applicants submit that Lujic and Hastings fail to disclose or suggest every limitation of claim 7 and the claims that depend from it for this additional reason.

New Claims

New claim 32 is supported by original claims 2, 5, 7, and 10, and at least Figure 3 of the present application. New claim 33 tracks the limitations of original claim 9. Applicants submit that the prior art of record fails to disclose or suggest a fireproof system for protecting a computer hardware device that includes a connection system having first and second wire members aligned longitudinally, a connection point arranged between the free ends of the wire members and comprising heat sensitive material, and a biasing member that applies a tension force longitudinally to at least one of the wire members at the connection point, as required by claim 32. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 32 and 33 are in condition for allowance.

In view of the above, Applicants request reconsideration of the application in the form of a Notice of Allowance. If a phone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues related to this matter, please contact Applicant's attorney of record listed below at 612-371-5387.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: September 2, 2005


Joshua N. Randall
Reg. No. 50,719
JNR:ae